

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/713,512	11/14/2000	Nicolaas M.J. Vermeulin	275102001001	4513
75	90 03/26/2002			
Morrison & Foerster LLP			EXAMINER	
3811 Valley Ce Suite 500	ntre Drive		O SULLIVAN, PETER G	
San Diego, CA 92130-2332			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	7,
			DATE MAILED: 03/26/2002	/

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/713,512

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Art Unit

r

Peter O'Sullivan

1621

Vermeulen et al.



The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the co	ver sheet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply w be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, of - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing de earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this ause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). ate of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This action is not	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quay.	r formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
Disposition of Claims	
	is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above, claim(s) 42, 43, 53-59, and 62-87	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢 Claim(s) <u>36-41, 44-52, 60, and 61</u>	is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) Claims	
Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected is proposed drawing correction filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under a) All b) Some* c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been recovered as a Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been recovered application from the International Bureau (PCT is *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies.	eceived. eceived in Application No s have been received in this National Stage Rule 17.2(a)).
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority to Attachment(s)	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
	rview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
	ice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
7) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 20) Oth	er:

Application/Control Number: 09/713,512

Art Unit: 1621

1. Claims 36-87 are pending in this application which should be reviewed for errors.

References not initialed on applicants' form 1449 were not available to the examiner and

applicants are requested to send copies with their next response.

2. Claims 36-87 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising

Page 2

compounds, for example, that have a valine or arginine moiety. Applicant is required under 35

U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

3. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Lau on 12 December 2001 a provisional

election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of N'-lysylspermine. Affirmation of

this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Applicants' N'1-lysyl and

N'-valyl spermines wherein R is H and R' may be methyl or ethyl are examined therewith.

Claims 42, 43, 53-59 and 62-87 are held withdrawn as not embracing the elected species and/or

because they contained non-examined species and are not currently under rejection.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the

inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently

named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any

amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the

fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

i

Application/Control Number: 09/713,512 Page 3

Art Unit: 1621

6. Claims 36-41, 44-52, 60 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The recitation of "or analogue thereof wherein" is confusing. Listing of the four substituents after R" is suggested.

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 8. Claims 36-41, 44, 60 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cherksey et al., (WO 91/00853) who disclose lysylspermine on page 19.
- 9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was

Application/Control Number: 09/713,512

Art Unit: 1621

made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 10. Claims 36-41, 44-52, 60 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cherksey et al. who disclose the anticipating compound noted above to be useful as P channel activator and differs from the teaching of the instant invention in that homologues/positions isomers thereof and certain pharmaceutical forms are claimed by applicants. It would have been <u>prima facie</u> obvious at the time the invention was made to start with the teaching of the cited reference to make positions isomers/homologues thereof and to expect them to be useful as P channel activators. In re Mills, 126 USPQ 513. Applicants' solid, liquid forms etc. are standard pharmaceutical practice.
- 11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

12. Claims 3, 30, 31, 33 and 34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent No.

Application/Control Number: 09/713,512

Page 5

Art Unit: 1621

09/09/396,523. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they generically overlap.

- 13.. No claim is allowed.
- 14. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Peter O'Sullivan at telephone number (703) 308-4526.

PETER O'SULLIVAN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1200

,